

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are now pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 6 and 7. Claims 10-14 are added as new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Der Weij et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,781,245) in view of Isoda (JP-2000-041185).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In section 3 of the outstanding Office action, the Examiner asserts that the caption overlaying module in claim 1 is analogous to server 612, generator 614, inserter 616 and transmitter 618 of Van Der Weij, wherein the combined video and TXT data is transmitted from one location to another. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertions.

First of all, Van Der Weij at best appears to show some features regarding merging the TXT pages with the video image to generate the TV signal, but failed disclose the feature "generating a caption dot-matrix image with a transparent background according to the received information." FIGs. 2-5, show that the TXT page, which is generated by the TXT generator, is not a dot matrix image. In other words, the background of the TXT pages is not transparent. If the TXT pages are transparent, the other three video images in FIG. 1 will be displayed in FIGs. 2-5.

Secondly, the features of merging of the video image and the TXT pages shown in Van Der Weij do not teach the claimed features of mingling the two images into one image. Van Der Weij appears to show some features regarding combining video data and teletext data supplied via a transmission channel and providing the teletext data representative of a plurality of teletext pages. It also appears to show a system that combines a display video data and teletext data. For example, a server transmits the video data and the TXT data to users as well as receives commands from the users in order to provide individual TXT pages to individual users. The TXT data and the video data are combined on a user's display so as to give the impression of a TXT page illustrated with video data. See column 1, lines 4-9 and column 2, line 64 to column 3, line 3.

Further, column 4, lines 19-21 of Van Der Weij state "Inserter 616 merges the TXT data and the video data into a TV signal broadcasted by transmitter 618 via network 618." Column 4, lines 28-30 of Van Der Weij state "[p]referably, system 600 is provided with user-interactive features to let the user control the content of the video data and/or TXT data via a user-interactive application." Column 5, lines 1-3 of Van Der Weij state "for example, a virtual library, whereupon the server provides him selectively with video and/ or TXT information [.]". Column 5, lines 16-18 of Van Der Weij state "Server 612 starts an application that enables the user to select video/text information on (real) holiday destinations[.]" Column 5, lines 21-23 of Van Der Weij state "Different ones of the video windows can interactively be combined with different ones of the TXT pages." Column 6, Lines 35-39 of Van Der Weij state that "Similarly, a multiple-user game or multiple-user activity such as a video conference can be governed through

such TXT/video application. The video information may be received by apparatuses without TXT provisions.

From the above mentioned contents of Van Der Weij, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly appreciate that even if inserter 616 “merges” the TXT data and the video data into a TV signal broadcasted by transmitter 618 via network 608, the TXT data and the video data are not “mingled” into one image. In other words, the above exemplary portions of Van Der Weij show interactive features that enable selectively combining different ones of video windows with different ones of TXT pages according to users’ requests. The TXT data and the video data can be again separated at the receiving side and therefore are not transmitted as the claimed “mingled” image.

Claim 1 recites “overlaying the caption image on a digital service image to obtain the mingled image[.]” Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that claim 1 requires that at first the caption image is overlaid to a digital service image. For example, pixels of the caption are written into corresponding pixels of the digital service image. Thus, after overlaying, no matter whether or not the encoding or decoding is performed, the digital service image and the caption typically would not be separated again, because the corresponding pixels of the digital service image, where the pixels of the caption are overlaid, have already been changed and would not be restored to the pixels of the digital service image as before overlaying.

Applicants submit that Van Der Weij merely mentions that the inserter 616 can “merge” the TXT data and the video data into a TV signal (see column 4, lines 19-21), but does not teach or suggest that the “merging” process of the inserter 616 actually employs the claimed “overlaying” method to obtain a “mingled” image. From the above

cited exemplary portions of Van Der Weij, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would appreciate that the “merging” process in Van Der Weij may be implemented using a time-division mode--more specifically, utilizing the vertical blanking interval of the television signal to carry TXT data.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Van Der Weij does not teach the above mentioned features of claim 1, not to mention the other features such as “encoding the mingled image, and transmitting an encoded mingled image from the local side to the remote side to display captions on terminals at the remote side independently of caption processing.”

Further, Isoda fails to cure the deficiencies of Van Der Weij. Isoda at best shows a title synthesizing means superimposes a title picture to an original image about coding equipment of a television signal, and generates a main image (See paragraph [0005]). Paragraphs [0005] and [0006] do not teach or suggest generating of the title picture, and they also do not teach or suggest that the title picture is generated into a dot matrix image with a transparent background as required by claim 1. Figure 5 of Isoda shows that the main image 503 is obtained by synchronizing the original image 501 and the title picture 502. The title picture 502 is not transparent in background (for example, in Figure 5 the trees of the scene are not complete in the main image 503).

Therefore, Applicants submit that Isoda does not teach or suggest the features of “generating a caption image with a transparent background according to the received information” in claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

Claim 7 recites features similar to the above distinguishing features of claim 1. Thus, claim 7 and its dependent claims 8-10 also define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more of the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 11-14 are new. Applicants submit that claim 11 recites features similar to the above distinguishing features of claim 1. Thus, claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-14 define over the art cited by the Examiner at least for one or more of the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Further, claims 11-14 are directed to a video conference system including video conference terminals. In contrast, Van Der Weij and Isoda are directed to television broadcasting systems and do not teach or suggest those claimed features. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 11-14 define over the art cited by the Examiner additionally for the above mentioned features.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 2, 2010

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/tp
15459589.1